

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated June 24, 2005, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 5,895,450 (Sloo) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,032,184 (Cogger et al.).

By the present response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo in view of Cogger et al. Applicants have discussed the deficiencies of Sloo in Applicants' previously-filed response and re-assert all arguments submitted in that response. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and provide the following additional remarks.

Regarding claims 1, 5 and 6, Applicants submit that neither Sloo nor Cogger et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, accepting, by a deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus from a deliberation-requesting-party, an input for designating sent-out contents capable of being browsed on a provider-side processing apparatus connected via a network; or receiving, by said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus, ticket information for identifying a sending-party sending out said designated sent-out contents, from said provider-side processing apparatus, said ticket information

having been issued by a ticket management processing apparatus and not including personal information on said sending-party; or transmitting said sent-out contents and said ticket information together with ticket information for identifying a deliberation-requesting party from said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus to a deliberation support processing apparatus to request a deliberation about said sent-out contents, said ticket information for identifying said deliberation-requesting-party having been issued by said ticket management processing apparatus and not including personal information on said deliberation-requesting-party; or transmitting said personal information on said sending-party identified by said ticket information for identifying said sending-party, from said ticket management processing apparatus to said deliberation support processing apparatus when said deliberation result indicates that said sent-out contents include an illegality; or transmitting said deliberation result stored in said deliberation managing database and said personal information on said sending-party received from said ticket management processing apparatus, from said deliberation support processing apparatus to said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus.

The Examiner asserts that Sloo discloses accepting an input for designating sent-out contents capable of being browsed on a provider side processing apparatus connected via network at col. 3, lines 7-18. However, these portions of Sloo merely disclose that subjects may be any responsible person or entity, the hardware associated with the Sloo system, and that access terminals receive complaints and

responses from users, deliver them to the central computer and receive transmissions from the central computer. These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest anything related to a provider side processing apparatus connected to a network, or a deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus accepting an input designating sent-out contents, capable of being browsed, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest anything related to a browser, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Sloo discloses receiving, by said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus, ticket information for identifying a sending-party sending out said designated sent-out contents, from said provider-side processing apparatus, at col. 5, lines 12-28. However, as has been noted previously, Sloo merely discloses that a complaint is sent from a complainant to a subject thereby to settle a dispute. Sloo discloses that the dispute can be settled if the complainant knows the whereabouts (e.g., a name, address, etc.) of the subject. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to a system for resolving a dispute which has occurred based on a complaint against a libel/slander message (corresponding to "sent-out contents" in the claims) written onto a homepage (i.e., "capable of being browsed on a provider side processing apparatus"). Sloo does not disclose or suggest receiving, by said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus, ticket information where the ticket information is issued by a ticket management processing apparatus and does not include personal information on said sending-party, as recited in the claims of the

present application. According to the present invention, the deliberation of the dispute continues while maintaining anonymity of a user who wrote the message, and that only if the complainant is true and the message includes illegality is personal information of the user who wrote the message disclosed. Sloo discloses the subject being known to the complainant (see col. 5, lines 10-20).

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Sloo discloses transmitting said sent-out contents and said ticket information together with ticket information for identifying a deliberation-requesting party from said deliberation-requesting-party-side processing apparatus to a deliberation support processing apparatus to request a deliberation about said sent-out contents, at col. 7, lines 28-40 and col. 8, lines 5-60. However, these portions of Sloo merely disclose the options available to a user after selecting the "Settle a Dispute" option where the options include: "Negotiate the Complaint", "Request a Judge/Jury", "Automatic Negotiator", and "Appeal a Decision", and also disclose specific details on the "Request a Judge/Jury" option. This is not transmitting said sent-out contents and said ticket information together with ticket information for identifying a deliberation-requesting party, said ticket information for identifying said deliberation-requesting-party having been issued by said ticket management processing apparatus and not including personal information on said deliberation-requesting-party, as recited in the claims of the present application. Sloo teaches disclosing personal information by in that "[t]he judge/jury is encouraged to consider all relevant information including . . . past history of

complainant and subject as described in their respective performance records", (see, col. 8, lines 44-49).

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Sloo discloses transmitting personal information on a sending party identified by information from a management processing apparatus to the deliberation support processing apparatus, and transmitting the deliberation results stored in the deliberation managing database and the personal information on the sending party received from the ticket management processing apparatus from the deliberation support processing apparatus to the deliberation requesting party side processing apparatus, at col. 16, lines 30-60 and col. 9, lines 5-15. However, these portions of Sloo are not related at all to these limitations in the claims of the present application. These portions of Sloo merely disclose that the complaint handling apparatus can determine whether a reported complaint is a violation of law and identify the laws/rules that were broken, and that a subject that prevails in the dispute may have a rating increased if the party prevailed against has a good reputation and may have a rating increased to a lesser amount if the prevailed against party has a poorer reputation, and that program notifies the complainant and subject of the judgment, and that the performance of a judge and jurors may be monitored and stored. These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest transmitting personal information on a sending party identified by a ticket information for identifying the sending party, from a ticket management processing apparatus to a deliberation support processing apparatus when the deliberation result indicates that the sent-out contents include an illegality, or

transmitting the deliberation results stored in a deliberation managing database, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Sloo merely relate to a rating given to a subject who prevails over a party based on the rating of the party. These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest anything related to personal information of a sending party identified by ticket information or transmitting personal information if the sent-out contents include an illegality.

The Examiner admits that Sloo does not disclose or suggest "ticket management processing apparatus", but asserts that Cogger et al. discloses this limitation in the col. 4, lines 9-34. However, these portions of Cogger et al. merely disclose that a trouble ticket may be submitted to the CSM and displayed in a browser based frame through a GUI permitting monitoring of all existing trouble tickets. This is not ticket information for identifying a sending-party sending out designated sent-out contents, from a provider-side processing apparatus, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, the cited portions of Cogger et al. do not disclose or suggest a ticket management processing apparatus, or specifically transmitting personal information on a sending party identified by a ticket information for identifying the sending-party, from a ticket management processing apparatus to a deliberation support processing apparatus when the deliberation result indicates that the sent-out contents includes an illegality, as recited in the claims of the present application.

The limitations in the claims of the present application relate to a means for resolving a dispute without disclosing personal information of parties concerned.

Issuance of a "ticket" for identifying an information center and management means is constituted by only information by which a person cannot be identified. Further, since Applicants' "ticket" is issued only by a ticket issuer (reliable organization), it is impossible for a third party to uniquely specify the information sender. Therefore, according to the present invention, a dispute can be resolved while assuring high anonymity by avoiding a risk which will be caused by the disclosure of personal information as to the parties concerned.

Regarding claim 2, Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest transmitting said inquiry contents and said ticket information for identifying said sending-party together with said ticket information for identifying said deliberation-responsible-party from said deliberation support processing apparatus to said ticket management processing apparatus, or in response to said inquiry contents and both said ticket information thus received, making, by said ticket management processing apparatus, reference to a mail address indicated as a contact address included in said personal information for identifying said sending- party.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Sloo nor Cogger et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 of the present application. Applicants

respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.40756X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 684-1120